

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/001,497	11/14/2001	Leola Henry	PIL0123/US	3217
33072	7590 07/01/2004		EXAMINER	
KAGAN BINDER, PLLC SUITE 200, MAPLE ISLAND BUILDING			TRAN LIEN, THUY	
•	REET NORTH		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
STILLWATER, MN 55082			1761	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	$\langle \rangle \langle \rangle$
Advisory Action	10/001,497	HENRY ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lien T Tran	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated abandonment of this applicated abandment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the content of the	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CF	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appr	on. See MPEP ropriate extension
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	originally set in the final	Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	is.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	• • •		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	t(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided belo)∏ will be entered a ow or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:	P	LIEN TRAN RIMARY EXAMINER	
		Group 1700	i

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument is not persuasive for reason of record. The excerpt from the cookbook is not deemed sufficient to define the claimed product over the prior art of record. The examiner recognizes that there is a difference between bread and biscuit; however, it is the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make a biscuit dough from the disclosure in the prior art..